

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

VINCENT MAURICE TEASLEY, JR.	)	Case No. 04-73973
	)	
Plaintiff.	)	Arthur J. Tarnow
	)	District Judge
v.	)	
	)	
THE CITY OF PONTIAC, et al.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DE 42], GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO  
WITHDRAW ADMISSIONS, RE-OPENING DISCOVERY, AND DIRECTING  
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO RETAIN CO-COUNSEL**

Before the Court is Defendants' motion for summary judgment [DE 42]. The Court heard oral argument on the motion on April 27, 2006. For the reasons stated on the record at the motion hearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Bolt and Aguilera.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claims against the City of Pontiac.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED as to all of Plaintiff's claims against the City of Pontiac Police Department.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as to Plaintiffs' claims against the City of Pontiac under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 pending further discovery.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is DENIED as to Plaintiffs claims against Defendants Berry, Hermans, Lopez, and Moon under 42

Teasley v. City of Pontiac, et al.  
Case No. 04-73973

U.S.C. § 1983.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is DENIED as to Plaintiff's state law claims against Defendants Berry, Hermans, Lopez, and Moon.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's counsel shall find co-counsel from outside his law firm to assist Plaintiff in this litigation, and that co-counsel shall file an appearance in this case no later than May 15, 2006.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to withdraw Rule 36 admissions is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that discovery shall be re-opened for thirty days following the appearance of Plaintiff's new co-counsel.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that during the supplemental discovery period, Plaintiff shall be made available for deposition and Defendant shall produce any relevant documents and records requested by Plaintiff, including the disciplinary files of Officers Berry, Hermans, Lopez, and Moon.

SO ORDERED.

Date: May 1, 2006

S/Arthur J. Tarnow  
Arthur J. Tarnow  
United States District Judge

Copies of this Order were served on Attorneys of Record either by electronic means or by U.S. Mail.

S/Kendra Byrd  
Deputy Clerk